

KEVIN RYAN (CSBN 118321)  
 United States Attorney  
 EUMI L. CHOI (WVSB 0722)  
 Chief, Criminal Division  
 DEREK R. OWENS (CASBN 230237 )  
 Special Assistant United States Attorney  
 DRIA FEARN  
 Law Clerk  
 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 11th Floor  
 San Francisco, California 94102  
 Telephone: (415) 436-6488  
 Fax: (415) 436-7234  
 Email: Derek.Owens@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	)	CR No.: 05-00726 MAG
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	<u>STIPULATION AND</u>
	)	<u>ORDER EXCLUDING</u>
	)	<u>TIME</u>
v.	)	
	)	
KHAHILIAH THYJUAN JACKSON,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

On March 31, 2006, the parties in this case appeared before the Court and stipulated that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from March 31, 2006 through April 20, 2006 for effective preparation of counsel, in that defense counsel required adequate time for effective assistance of defense counsel. The parties represented that granting the continuance was the reasonable time necessary for effective preparation of defense counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(B)(iv). The parties also agreed that the ends of justice served by granting such a continuance outweighed the best

interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(8)(A).

SO STIPULATED:

KEVIN V. RYAN  
United States Attorney

DATED: 4/12/06

/s/  
DRIA FEARN  
Law Clerk


DATED: 4/10/06

/s/  
ELIZABETH M. FALK  
Attorney for Ms. Jackson

As the Court found on March 31, 2006, and for the reasons stated above, the Court finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweigh the best interests of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial and that time should be excluded from the Speedy Trial Act calculations from March 31, 2006 through April 20, 2006 for effective preparation of defense counsel and the United States. See 18 U.S.C. §3161 (h)(8)(A). The failure to grant the requested continuance would deny counsel reasonable time necessary for effective preparation and continuity of counsel, taking into account the exercise of due diligence, and would result in a miscarriage of justice. See 18 U.S.C. §3161(h)(8)(B)(iv).

SO ORDERED.

DATED: April 17, 2006

  
BERNARD ZIMMERMAN  
United States Magistrate Judge